IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Serial No.	:	09/807,774	Confirmation No.: 4626
Applicant	:	Harald KAUFMANN	
Filed	:	April 17, 2001	
Group Art Unit:		2854	
Examiner	:	ZIMMERMAN, Joshua	
Docket No.	:	436.0004	
Customer No.:		25534	
For	:	SERIAGRAPHY REFLECTION TRANSFER PRODUCT AND METHOD FOR PRODUCING THE SAME	

ELECTION IN RESPONSE TO ELECTION OF SPECIES REQUIREMENT

Assistant Commissioner of Patents
Alexandria, Virginia 22314

Sir:

In response to the Election of Species Requirement dated April 28, 2010, Applicant hereby elected Species X: Method wherein the adhesive layer and the reflection transfer ink layer are applied separately without traverse. Pending Claims 43-58 and 60-61 read upon the elected species.

Applicant respectfully notes that search and examination of both Species X and Y would not present any undue, serious burden on the Examiner. In fact, previously-examined canceled Claim 29 recites substantially similar subject matter to pending Claim 59 (non-elected Species Y). As this subject matter has already been considered during the lengthy prosecution of this patent application, Applicant requests rejoinder of Claim 59 with the pending claims without any admission that the claims are patentably indistinct.

Further, Applicant also notes that original Claim 5 in the application as filed recites similar subject matter to pending Claim 59. There was no finding of lack of Unity of Invention when the application was filed between original Claims 1 and 5. In fact, original Claims 1-9 were *grouped together*. See Restriction Requirement dated 2002-09-11. Thus, it is unclear why there is finding of lack of Unity of Invention at the present time between species X and Y. Clarification is respectfully requested.